UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,142	12/29/2000	Mikko Nuutinen	944-001.041	8428

4955 7590 03/15/2004

WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS &
ADOLPHSON, LLP
BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5
755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224
MONROE, CT 06468

EXAMINER	
MCARDLE, JOSEPH M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2132	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/752,142	NUUTINEN, MIKKO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph McArdle	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 December 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 December 0200* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4,8*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent publication No. 2002/0102999 by Maggenti. In regards to claim 1, Maggenti discloses a design on page 3, paragraph 59 that is directed towards a net broadcast service for enabling internet protocol communication devices to participate in a group voice and data conference (this is defined in the aforementioned location as voice over internet protocol). Maggenti further discloses on page 3, paragraph 65, a control manager that manages the operation of the system. Maggenti then goes on to disclose on page 4, paragraph 67 that a security manager (used to support secure networks) corresponding to the control manager may be present. This disclosure meets the first limitation set forth under claim 1 that calls for having a security manager. Maggenti then discloses on page 4, paragraph 68 that the aforementioned security manager conforming to an application program interface is capable of performing key management, user authentication and other tasks relating to securing networks. This disclosure meets the limitations set forth under claim 1 that call for having a security

manager interface for interfacing between the security manager and security applications because the security manager described in Maggenti's design is able to perform key management and user authentication throughout the network. Maggenti then discloses on pages 5-6, paragraph 86 and in figure 3 that the control module core (security manager) contains a media control unit that sends and receives information (via an interface) as necessary from the control unit. This disclosure meets the limitations set forth under claim 1 that calls for having a security media interface for interfacing between the security manager and a media controller. Maggenti then discloses on page 6, paragraph 92 and in figure 4 that a session initiation protocol stack is comprised of multiple network layers that implement network communications between the protocol layers. Figure 3 then shows how the control manager (security manager) is used to connect (interface) all of the various components together. These disclosures meet the limitations set forth under claim 1 that call for allowing the security manager to interface with the protocol stack and an application layer because in Maggenti's design, the control manager (security manager) is used to interface with the session initiation protocol stack, which is comprised of various network layers thereby allowing the control manager (security manager) to interface with an application layer.

3. In regards to claim 2, Maggenti discloses in figure 15 and on page 16, paragraph 207 how the control manager (security manager) has an idle state and also a state where it is waiting for a communications device to acknowledge its presence to the control manager (wait for authorization state). These disclosures meet the exact limitations set froth under claim 2.

4. In regards to claim 4, Maggenti discloses in page 6, paragraph 92 and in figure 4 the use of a session initiation protocol (SIP) signaling stack. Maggenti further discloses in the same location that the stack is a collection of network layers that implements network communications between network protocol layers. Maggenti also discloses on page 5, paragraph 82 that the session initiation protocol supports internet telephony applications by providing means to perform such functions as describing media parameters. The above disclosure by Maggenti meets the limitations set forth under claim 4 that call for having a session initiation protocol signaling stack (see page 6, paragraph 92) that can interface to a telephony application (see page 5, paragraph 82) and different network layers (see page 6, paragraph 92). Maggenti then discloses in figure 3 the interconnections between the session initiation protocol stack and the media controller unit, which can be used to allow both of them to interface with a telephony application as well as a network layer as described on pages 5-6, paragraphs 82 and 92. This disclosure meets the limitations set forth under claim 4 that call for having a media interface for interface with both a network layer and the session initiation protocol stack.

5. In regards to claim 5, Maggenti discloses a design on page 3, paragraph 59 that is directed towards a net broadcast service for enabling internet protocol devices to participate in a group voice and data conference (this is defined in the aforementioned location as voice over internet protocol). Maggenti further discloses on page 6, paragraph 92 and in figure 4 that a session initiation protocol stack is comprised of multiple network layers that implement network communications between the protocol

layers. Figure 3 then shows how the control manager (security manager) is used to connect (interface) all of the various components together. This disclosure meets the limitations set forth under claim 5 that call for interfacing between the security manager and the session initiation protocol stack. Maggenti further discloses on page 4, paragraph 68 that the security manager conforms to an application program interface that is capable of performing key management, user authentication, and other tasks relating to securing networks. This disclosure meets the limitations set forth under claim 5 that call for having a security manager interface for interfacing between the security manager and security applications because the security manager described in Maggenti's design is able to perform key management and user authentication throughout the network. Maggenti then discloses on pages 5-6, paragraph 86 and in figure 3 that the control module core contains a media control unit that sends and receives information (via an interface) as necessary from the control unit. This disclosure meets the limitations set forth under claim 5 that calls for having a security media interface for interfacing between the security manager a media controller. Maggenti finally discloses on page 5, paragraph 82 that the session interface protocol supports internet telephony applications by providing means for performing such functions as describing media parameters. This disclosure meets the limitations set forth under claim 5 that call for interfacing between the security manager and a telephony application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maggenti in view of the publication "Signaling for Internet Telephony" (Feb 2, 1998) by Schulzrinne and Rosenberg. In regards to claim 3, Maggenti's design disclosed above meets all of the aforementioned limitations of claim 2 described above. However, Maggenti's design does not specifically mention changing states according to whether an invitation from an initiating device is authorized. Schulzrinne and Rosenberg's publication describes a session initiation protocol in Section 2.3 that is used to establish communications between Internet end systems. Schulzrinne and Rosenberg's publication then goes on to disclose in section 3.1 that authoritative responses are used to indicate the results of client invitations as well as the state of these invitations (i.e. is the invitation authorized). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the features taught By Schulzrinne and Rosenberg, which are directed towards providing authorization responses indicating the result and status of client initiated invitations, into Maggenti's design in order to achieve a design that is capable of transitioning between a wait for

authorization state and an idle state depending on whether or not a client initiated invitation is to be authorized.

8. In regards to claims 6-8, Maggenti discloses a design on page 3, paragraph 59 that is directed towards a net broadcast service for enabling internet protocol devices to participate in a group voice and data conference (this is defined in the aforementioned location as voice over internet protocol). Maggenti further discloses on page 6, paragraph 92 and in figure 4 that a session initiation protocol stack is comprised of multiple network layers that implement network communications between the protocol layers. Figure 3 then shows how the control manager (security manager) is used to connect (interface) all of the various components together. Maggenti further discloses in figure 11 and on page 12, paragraphs 158, 161 and 164 how session interface protocol signaling works. Maggenti further discloses in the aforementioned locations that a communications device (remote user agent) can send an invite signal to a session interface protocol stack. Maggenti also discloses that the session interface protocol stack can issue an invite signal back to a communication device (remote user agent) by using redirection mechanisms as described in figure 11 and paragraph 161 on page 12. Maggenti then goes on to disclose on page 12, paragraph 164 that responses to the invite signals (ACKs) are passed between the communication device (remote user agent) and the session initiation protocol stack. These disclosures meet the limitations set forth under claims 6-8 that call for passing invite signals between a remote user agent and a session initiation protocol stack and then responding to the invite signals with acknowledgments (ACKs). Maggenti further discloses on page 4,

paragraph 68 that a security manager conforming to an application program interface is capable of performing key management, user authentication and other tasks relating to securing networks. This disclosure meets the limitations set forth under claims 6-8 that call for having a security manager to provide authorization for the connection requests (invite signals) and also for providing encryption for the network. However, Maggenti's design does not disclose that the acknowledgements signals passed between a remote user agent and a session initiation protocol stack in response to received invite signals are indicative of whether the invite signals are authorized. Schulzrinne and Rosenberg's publication describes a session initiation protocol in Section 2.3 that is used to establish communications between internet end systems. Schulzrinne and Rosenberg's publication then goes on to disclose in section 3.1 that authoritative responses are used to indicate the result of the invite signals as well as the state of the invite signal (i.e. is the invite signal authorized). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the features taught by the features taught By Schulzrinne and Rosenberg, which are directed towards providing authorization responses indicating the result and status of invite signals, into Maggenti's design in order to achieve a design that is capable is allowing the acknowledgement signals (response signals relating to received invite signal) passed between a remote user agent and a session initiation protocol stack to contain information indicative of whether or not the invite signals are authorized.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph McArdle whose telephone number is (703) 305-7515. The examiner can normally be reached on Weekdays from 8:00 am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (703) 305-1830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph McArdle
Examiner
Art Unit 2132

jmm

GILBERTO BARRON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100